

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
April 10, 2006

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph.
Ed Hooker, MHDC Architectural Engineer, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: David Barr (alternate), Tilmon Brown, Douglas Kearley, Cindy Klotz, Harris Oswalt, Cameron Pfeiffer, Bunky Ralph, Jim Wagoner.

Members Absent: Robert Brown Michael Mayberry, Joe Sackett, David Tharp.

Staff Members Present: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis, John Lawler

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Darrel J. Williams	P.O. Box 6193 36660	045-05/06-CA
Maura Garino	Lafayette Plaza	050-05/06-CA
Carrie Russell	1562 Old Shell Rd.	051-0/06-CA
Terry & Yvonne Edeker	59 N. Monterey	053-05/06-CA

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Cindy Klotz moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Louis Anderson
Property Address: 116 Hallett Street
Date of Approval: 3/16/06 asc
Work Approved: Install 3 tab shingles, Desert Tan in color.
2. Applicant's Name: Ray Sandifer
Property Address: 51 Semmes Avenue
Date of Approval: 3/16/06 km/weh
Work Approved: Install 5 v-crimp metal galvalume roof.
3. Applicant's Name: Jack Chavers
Property Address: 1651 Government Street
Date of Approval: 3/16/06 asc
Work Approved: Paint building in the following BLP color scheme:
Body – Dauphin Street Light Gold
Trim – White
Front Door – White
Porch Floor – Bellingrath Green
Porch Ceiling – Selma Street Gray or Robin's Egg Blue
4. Applicant's Name: Oakland and Kelly McCullouch
Property Address: 58 North Monterey Street
Date of Approval: 3/16/06 weh
Work Approved: Repaint exterior in the following color scheme:

Body – Government Street Olive
Trim – DeTonti Square Off White
Shutters - Black

5. Applicant's Name: Louis Hassell
Property Address: 102 LeVert Avenue
Date of Approval: 3/16/06 weh
Work Approved: Install cornice, soffit and fascia on rear elevation where sunroom was removed. Materials to match existing original materials in material, profile and dimension. Paint to match existing.
6. Applicant's Name: Ralph Hargrove
Property Address: 1461 Brown Street
Date of Approval: 3/17/06 weh
Work Approved: Repaint building in existing color scheme. Color to be Devoe Queen Anne's Lace
7. Applicant's Name: Mark and Denise Burks
Property Address: 1559 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 3/17/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace second story porch balustrade with materials matching existing in materials, profile and dimension.
8. Applicant's Name: Golden Gate Properties
Property Address: 128 North Julia Street
Date of Approval: 3/20/06 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in material and dimension. Paint building in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
Body – Roycroft Suede
Trim – Roycroft Vellum
Doors and Lattice – Polished Mahogany
9. Applicant's Name: Jim Walker
Property Address: 602 Church Street
Date of Approval: 3/20/06 weh
Work Approved: Remove front steps and repair to original condition. Construct temporary wood steps while cast iron is being repaired.
10. Applicant's Name: T Matthews Construction
Property Address: 59 Hallett Street
Date of Approval: 3/23/06 weh
Work Approved: Install 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.
11. Applicant's Name: Ben Cummings
Property Address: 1011 Augusta Street
Date of Approval: 3/23/06 weh
Work Approved: Install Timberline shingles, Pewter Gray Blend in color.

12. Applicant's Name: Flo-Claire Neighborhood Assn. (Lise Shivers)
 Property Address: McDonald and West Entrance Gates
 Date of Approval: 3/24/06 jdb
 Work Approved: Install cast aluminum sign at McDonald Ave. entrance, arched to span between the two entrance columns per plans submitted. Paint Flo-Claire on entry columns at West Street, font to match sign at McDonald. Letters to be painted black.
13. Applicant's Name: TCB Improvements
 Property Address: 201 George Street
 Date of Approval: 3/27/06 weh
 Work Approved: Install architectural or dimensional shingles, gray in color.
14. Applicant's Name: Michael and Lorna Huey
 Property Address: 1059 (1061) Dauphin Street
 Date of Approval: 3/27/06 weh
 Work Approved: Paint trim, accents and shutters on exterior of building as submitted. Unpainted brick to remain unpainted. Add Sunbrella fabric awnings per submitted plans.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **045-05/06-CA** 203 South Warren Street
 Applicant: David McDonald, Owner/Darrel J. Williams, Designer
 Nature of Request: Enclose rear porch as per submitted plans. Construct new rear porch as per submitted plans.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.
2. **072-04/05-CA** 306 Marine Street
 Applicant: Hubert H. Stokes/Sim Stokes
 Nature of Request: Demolish fire-damaged residence, clean lot and install grass.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **049-05/06-CA** 1254 Government Street
 Applicant: Griffith Shell Service Station
 Nature of Request: Install canopy-covered vacuum stations per submitted plans and photos.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.
2. **050-05/06-CA** 301 Government Street
 Applicant: Lafayette Plaza Hotel
 Nature of Request: Remove existing windows and install new windows and in-fill remaining space as per submitted plans.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

3. **051-05/06-CA** 1562 Old Shell Road
 Applicant: Dwayne and Carrie Russell
 Nature of Request: Construct new carport/garage structure as per submitted plans.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
4. **052-05/06-CA** 311 South Ann Street
 Applicant: Steven Harris, Owner/Sunshine Metalworks, Contractor
 Nature of Request: Remove existing asbestos shingles & install Classic Products Oxford Shingle on home; install McElroy Meridian standing seam on garage.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
5. **053-05/06-CA** 59 North Monterey Street
 Applicant: Terry and Yvonne Edeker
 Nature of Request: Finish out attic; build 4 dormers. Remove existing handrails and replace with new handrails, all as per submitted plans.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
6. **054-05/06-CA** 908 Palmetto Street
 Applicant: Dave Donnelly
 Nature of Request: Install 4' high metal fence around front of property as per submitted plans; install 6 ft board fence with cap in rear yard.
DENIED metal fence. Staff can approve mid-month.
APPROVED wood fence. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENT

1. **National Alliance of Preservation Commissions Trip to Baltimore July 27-30, 2006**
 Staff distributed information on the conference. Anyone interested in attending should let Staff know before the end of May.
2. **Enforcement Issues**
 Devereaux Bemis discussed enforcement issues with the Board. The Board's previous counsel felt that violations should not come back before that Board because, in essence, the application would constitute a veiled appeal. Counsel considered that violations should be handled by Staff. Generally violations are relatively minor and staff has mitigated them. Recently several of the Board's orders were violated. When staff attempted mitigation, staff was accused of being capricious. As a result, staff wanted an advisory group to offer guidance in how to handle these violations and chose the Properties Committee. The Committee advised that Jeanelle Calla receive a Notice of Violation and subsequently be ticketed. This past Friday, a fax from Ms. Calla's attorney, was received. Since Staff can solicit advice from any party, Staff was requesting advice from the Board. After some discussion, since submitting a revised application would amount to a veiled appeal, the Board advised Staff to attempt some type of mitigation. If no

compromise proved workable then staff should proceed with the NOV and ticketing.

3. Bienville Square Guard House

The Board expressed concern over the guard house moved into Bienville Square. Staff reported that the Mayor had authorized the building and that it was constructed by Public Buildings. Since the Board considers the design inappropriate for this location, John Lawler and Devereaux will suggest a different design for the structure.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

2) "...From this {rear} porch, you can enter...or down the back steps to the wing." These statements suggest that there was originally no interior circulation between the main house and the rear service wing.

An inspection of underneath the wing and in the attic of the wing provided additional facts. The wing originally had a central fireplace measuring approximately 4' deep by approximately 6' wide. The framing for the fireplace still exists and is visible under the house. The piers for both the main house and the wing are constructed of Old Mobile brick and have lime/sand mortar. One of the piers for the main house has a skim coat of stucco. Also, the pier on the northwest corner of the house has raked marks, suggesting that at one time all of the piers had a stucco skim coat. The evidence of stucco suggests that the wing was not attached or constructed simultaneously with the main house because it would have been unnecessary to stucco a pier that was never going to be exposed.

In the attic it was determined that the 2x6 tongue & groove ceiling was original. Due to a heavy amount of blown-in insulation it was not determined if the ceiling joists still reflected framing for a central chimney. Also, the decking is all new plywood, so there is no way to determine the size of the chimney flue. In the west wall, where the wing was joined to the house, there is evidence of either an attic vent or an early connection between the attic of the main house and the attic of the wing. There is a header just below the ridge.

The windows and doors of the wing have been replaced, however the openings have not been altered. The transoms above the doors appear to be original. All interior material is modern – sheetrock, flooring, etc. Under the house it appeared that in the current kitchen area the flooring was removed and plywood sub-flooring was installed. Further to the east in the den area there was still original heart pine flooring visible underneath.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that "The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change: ... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district..."

STAFF ANALYSIS

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines and will impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

- A. The Guidelines state that "The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect the period... When rear porches are to be enclosed, one recommended method is to preserve the original configuration of columns, handrails, and other important architectural features."
1. The ca. 1866 Taber House is a one and one half story wood frame residence with Greek Revival styling.
 2. A one story service wing is located at the rear of the main residence.
 3. Staff believes the wing to pre-date the main residence.
 4. The exterior elements and window/door arrangement suggest that from an architectural style standpoint, the structure could have been constructed between 1840 and 1860.

5. The wing is smaller in scale and closer to the ground than the main residence.
6. There is a three bay inset porch on the south elevation of the rear wing.
7. The applicants are requesting to enclose this porch, utilizing the existing columns and railing system to retain the appearance of the porch.
8. The applicants are proposing to install louvered wood blinds as sheathing between the columns.
9. If approved, once the new exterior wall is constructed, the original exterior wall containing two windows and two doors will be removed to increase the size of the existing kitchen/den.
10. A new porch is proposed for the east and south elevations of the main residence.
11. The new porch elements (columns, railing, roof) will match that of the existing porch.
12. The Board has frequently allowed alterations to the rear of buildings in order to increase square footage.
13. This has been done principally to buildings where the rear of the house had previously been altered.
14. In other cases, the rear porch, though integral to the house, has not been considered a major feature of the property.
15. The enclosing of those porches has been viewed by the Board as not impairing the historic integrity of the buildings.
16. Generally what the Board has approved is reversible.
17. In this case, the wing is as significant as the main block of the house.

As stated in the Facts, it is the opinion of the Staff that this wing essentially retains the essential form of a modest Creole cottage/outbuilding. The destruction of the original porch wall and the alteration to the integral porch would drastically impair the historic integrity of the wing. Though other Creole cottages exist in the city, those built at this scale during the Antebellum period are exceedingly rare. Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted. The proposed changes will drastically alter the scale, massing and characteristics that currently are distinguishing historically-significant features.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Darrel Williams was present to discuss the application. He explained that he had contacted staff regarding the architectural integrity of the rear wing and was trying through his design to retain the character of the wing while accommodating a growing family. He also explained that staff gave him a copy of a 1973 report written by a USA student that reported the residence was built as a single unit, refuting the notion that the house was constructed and a relocated kitchen/cottage attached to the rear.

Mr. Williams explained that his drawing would retain columns and handrail, that flat tongue and groove lap siding would be used on the exterior wall and that shutters would be mounted above the handrail. The original exterior wall, now an interior wall, would be demolished. Windows would not be reused and insulated 6/6 windows would be installed, not the 9/9 light windows indicated on the plans. He stressed that all options had been exhausted including enclosing the wing with a glass storefront system. Staff explained that the form of the wing, whether its use was a kitchen or a residence, was intact. As the result of a 1970s renovation by Patricia Stevens, column, railing details, and wing fascia date from this period. Staff indicated that the transoms, porch ceiling, door and window trim and siding are original features. In addition, the foundation of the wing has a stuccoed pier that proves to Staff the pier would have been visible and that the wing was originally separate from the main block of the house. While the form remains, the interior of the wing has been gutted.

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Jim Wagoner noted that there had been a site visit by the designer, several members of the Board and Staff.

FINDING OF FACT

Cindy Klotz proposed additional facts based on the testimony presented at the meeting:

18. The wing has its original foundation framing, window and door trim, exterior walls, exterior siding, ceiling and transoms.
19. A site visit was made on Friday, March 30, 2006 by Jim Wagoner, Bunky Ralph, David Tharp, Devereaux Bemis, Ed Hooker and Darrell Williams.
20. The scale and massing of the original kitchen/cottage/shop is still apparent.
21. Windows to be 6/6 and not 9/9 as indicated on the drawings.

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report in addition to facts 18 through 21 noted above. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cameron Pfeiffer moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines. The motion was seconded by David Barr and approved with Tilmon Brown and Cindy Klotz voting in opposition.

Cindy Klotz moved to approve with application and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness conditioned upon the applicant retaining the original wall as an interior wall and retaining the cased openings. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved with Bunky Ralph and Cameron Pfeiffer voting in opposition.

Staff expressed concern that once the wall became an interior wall, the Board had no jurisdiction over it and had no way to monitor whether their order was followed.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/10/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

072-04/05 – CA 306 Marine Street
Applicant: Hubert H. Stokes/ Sim Stokes
Received: 3/22/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/07/06 1) 7/25/05 2) 8/22/05 3) 10/17/05 4) 4/10/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing (prior to fire)
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of the Project: Demolish existing historic residential structure severely damaged by fire. Landscape vacant lot once structure is removed.

History of the Project: This project was held over by the Board on two occasions to allow staff time to locate a potential buyer for the house and lot for restoration purposes. Staff was unable to solicit a buyer within the four week period during which the application was held over. However, at the August 22, 2005 meeting, Mr. Stokes noted he was in negotiations with someone who may be interested. These negotiations fell through and later Mr. Stokes sold the property to his nephew Mr. Sim Stokes, of Dallas, Texas. Sim Stokes met with staff to discuss his options. It was agreed that it would be in the best interest of the neighborhood if the structure could be rehabilitated and returned to use as a single family residence. Mr. Stokes was given a period of two months to pursue finding a purchaser willing to undertake the project, or determine if he could do it himself. Urban Development has issued numerous citations due to the condition of the property. In the latest court appearance, Judge Holmes Whiddon granted the current owner until April 27, 2006 to either sell the property or obtain a demolition permit from the ARB.

STAFF REPORT

Section 10 of the Preservation Ordinance prohibits the demolition or relocation of “any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such buildings will not be detrimental to the historical and architectural character of the district...” In making this determination, the Board must examine a number of factors set out in the ordinance, each of which is discussed below:

- A. Historic or Architectural Significance
 - 1. The Oakleigh Garden Historic District was created in 1972.
 - 2. 306 Marine Street is a one story shotgun structure.
 - 3. 306 Marine Street is a contributing structure within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 - 4. While listed as contributing, the structure has had significant incompatible alterations over time.

- B. Importance to the Integrity of the District
 - 1. Mobile’s Oakleigh Garden District neighborhood is a large, late 19th-century/early 20th-century suburban neighborhood...The majority of the development in this district...dates from the 1870s and 1880s through World War I. Within this large grouping are examples of various Victorian styles as well as large numbers of bungalows...Between 1830 and World War II, the district developed as a solidly middle-class residential neighborhood. The residential character is

evident in the size and massing of building form that represents adaptations to local climate considerations. In response to these influences, a group of buildings evolved that maintain a compactness of size, massing and consistent program while responding to a variety of stylistic influences...

C. Ability to Reproduce Historic Structures

1. The type and quality of the materials used in the construction of 306 Marine Street are no longer readily available.
2. The structure dates from the first quarter of the 20th century, before the introduction of nominal dimension lumber. Components include old growth pine structural members and siding, historic windows, doors and interior decoration, etc. Replacement material would have to be garnered from salvage yards or specially milled.
3. Though the removal of any historic building impairs the integrity of the district, it is the opinion of the staff that restoration of this building would result in the creation of a substantially new structure. Also this attempt to construct this new structure would not be economically feasible. Therefore, in the event that reconstruction was attempted, the cost to reproduce 306 Marine Street would be prohibitively expensive.

D. Ensemble of Historic Buildings Creating a Neighborhood

1. The subject property is one of numerous shotgun residences in the district.
2. Removal of this residence would erode the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

E. Proposed Redevelopment Plans for the Site

1. The application states that the site will be cleared of building debris and grassed.

F. Effect of Proposed Project on the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

1. The removal of 306 Marine Street would degrade the streetscape along this relatively intact section of Marine Street.
2. The removal of 306 Marine Street would impair the architectural, cultural, historical, social, aesthetic and environmental character of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

G. Content of Application

1. Property information:
 - a. 306 Marine Street was acquired by the applicant in 2005 for \$25,000.
 - b. The applicant states that the property was in poor condition due to a fire.
 - c. The property is currently unoccupied.
2. Alternatives Considered
 - a. The applicant states that he has exhausted all efforts to retain the residence.
3. Sale of Property by Current Owner
 - a. Information presented in the application notes that 306 Marine Street has been listed for sale for \$36,000.
 - b. Applicant states that he is currently in negotiations to sell the property.
4. Financial Proof
 - a. No financial proof was included with the application.

Based on the above facts, Staff recommends approval of the request to demolish.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff reported that there had been one call from a neighborhood resident who was in favor of the demolition. There were no comments from city departments to read into the record.

Staff also reported that the applicant had an offer on the lot once the house had been demolished and the lot cleared. He is asking \$24,000 and it is reported that he has an offer of \$22,000. Staff has tried to help the owner find a buyer. The owner has been in court last week.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Douglas Kearley moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report deleting facts D.2 and F.1 and 2. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and approved with Bunky Ralph voting in opposition.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswald moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved with Bunky Ralph and Tilmon Brown voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/10/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

049-05/06-CA 1254 Government Street
Applicant: Griffith Shell Service Station
Received: 3/24/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/09/06 1) 4/10/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-1, B-2, General Business
Nature of Project: Install canopy-covered vacuum stations per submitted plans and photos.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District Guidelines

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district...”

STAFF REPORT

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The subject lot is on the North side of Government Street between South Georgia Avenue and Ann Street.
2. The subject lot is two lots east of the existing Griffith Shell Service Station.
3. There is a heavily landscaped parking lot to the west, adjacent to the subject lot.
4. In 1999, the Board approved construction of a car wash on the lot to the west of the subject lot.
5. This car wash was designed as a background building, and today is covered in fig ivy.
6. The applicants are requesting to remove the existing free-standing vacuum stations and construct a 5-bay canopy and single vacuum to service 7 cars.
7. The proposed canopy will match the existing canopy of the service station.
8. The proposed canopy will be 12’ high and measure 15’ x 60’.
9. The existing car wash is gray painted concrete block.
10. The proposed color scheme for the canopy is white poles, with a red and yellow band around the perimeter of the roof structure.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted. However, staff would suggest that the applicants paint the columns gray to match the car wash.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. The Board asked Staff for clarification of the location of the vacuum station. Staff responded that it will replace the existing vacuums.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditional on the columns being painted gray. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved with Cindy Klotz voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/10/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

050-05/06-CA 301 Government Street
Applicant: Lafayette Plaza Hotel
Received: 3/24/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/09/06 1) 4/10/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non - Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Nature of Project: Remove existing guest room windows and install new smaller windows. Infill remaining space with materials to match the existing exterior walls, as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district...”

STAFF REPORT

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The Lafayette Plaza Hotel is a 16 story structure constructed ca. 1975 as a Sheraton Hotel.
2. The hotel is a non-contributing structure within the district due to its age.
3. The hotel occupies the block bounded by Government Street on the north, Church Street on the south, Jackson Street on the east and Claiborne Street on the west.
4. The applicants are proposing to remove the existing triple windows on all levels and replace them with single windows.
5. The applicants are also proposing to replace the existing hvac units.
6. The guest rooms of the hotel are laid out in a pie-shaped plan around a central core.
7. The exterior dimension of the guest rooms measures 18'-4".
8. The existing windows take up the entire width of the flat surface of the exterior wall.
9. The proposed new windows measure approximately 5'-5 1/2" wide by 4'-6" tall
10. New hvac units are located directly under the window and measure 3'-6" wide by 1'-6" tall.
11. The proposed new windows are constructed of dark bronze anodized aluminum with solar bronze tinted glass.
12. The grille for the new hvac units will be finished to match the dark bronze anodized aluminum window frames.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Maura Garino was present to discuss the application. She stated that the sign was not part of this application.

She was questioned by the Board regarding the color of the air conditioning grills and stated that they would be dark bronze to match the window frames

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Douglas Kearley moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/10/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

051-05/06-CA 1562 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Dwayne and Carrie Russell
Received: 3/24/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/09/06 1) 4/10/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (new construction)
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Construct one story frame carport/garage as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines For Mobile's Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district...

STAFF REPORT

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The subject property is a ca. 1997 one and a half story frame residence with wood siding and brick veneer.
2. The subject property is a non-contributing structure within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District due to its age.
3. The subject lot measures 57.45' at the Old Shell Road property line and widens to 120.57' at the rear property line; the east property line measures 240.12' and the west property line measures 204.15'.
4. The proposed structure is to be placed in the northwest corner of the rear of the lot.
5. The proposed structure measures approximately 22' wide by 57' long.
6. The proposed structure has a ground-to-eave height of 12'.
7. The proposed structure contains a carport measuring 24' x 22', a garage measuring 33' x 15', a covered patio measuring 27' x 7' and a changing room measuring 6' x 7'.
8. The carport is supported by 8" wood columns matching those on the rear porch of the existing house.
9. The exterior of the proposed structure is to be brick to match the brick on the existing house.
10. Lap siding will be used under the porch as a wall material.
11. Both the north and south elevations will have garage doors, painted metal panels.
12. The roof will be end gabled, with shingles matching those on the existing house.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted with the following information to be provided by the applicant:

1. Information on the garage door – either a photograph or a brochure.
2. Information on the windows and doors to be used in the structure.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Applicant Carrie Russell was present to discuss the application. She discussed that the garage materials would match the main house: brick, columns, wood lap siding, fish scale shingles in front gable and paint colors. The house is brick with a wood front and synthetic stucco in the gable ends. She asked to use roll up doors with the appearance of carriage doors on the south elevation and metal doors on the north elevation.

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Douglas Kearley moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report modifying fact 11 to read:

“Carriage doors will be used on the south elevation and metal doors on the north elevation.” The motion was seconded by Cindy Klotz and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditional on the garage doors and windows being presented to Staff. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/10/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

052-05/06-CA 311 South Ann Street
Applicant: Steven Harris, Owner/Sunshine Metalworks, Contractor
Received: 3/24/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/09/06 1) 4/10/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Remove existing asbestos shingles & install Classic
Products Oxford Shingle on home; install McElroy
Meridian standing seam on garage.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines For Mobile's Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district...”

STAFF REPORT

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The subject structure is a ca. 1910 two story wood frame American Foursquare with a monolithic hipped roof.
2. The subject structure currently has asbestos tile roofing.
3. The applicants are requesting to install steel roofing panels.
4. The steel roofing panels are Classic Products Oxford Shingles (steel panels).
5. The roofing color will be dark grey.
6. The applicants are requesting to install a standing seam roof on the detached garage.
7. Often garages were considered secondary buildings so a change in roofing material would be appropriate in this case.
8. The Board approved a similar roof in November 2005 for 204 South Ann Street.
9. Based on the architectural style of the structure and because the roof is not very visible to the street, these types of steel shingles would be appropriate.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

The Board questioned Staff regarding the roofing to be used on the garage. Staff clarified that it would be an interlocking standing seam roof.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion regarding amending fact 6 to read:
“The applicants are requesting to install a McElroy Meridian standing seam roof on the detached garage.”

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as amended. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/10/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

053-05/06-CA 59 North Monterey Street
Applicant: Terry and Yvonne Edeker
Received: 3/24/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/09/06 1) 4/10/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Finish out attic; build 4 dormers.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines For Mobile's Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district...”

STAFF REPORT

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, part of the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district. These elements are the proposed front and rear dormers. Part of the proposed work does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines and will impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district. These elements are the proposed side dormers.

1. The ca. 1915 Chester House is a one story frame bungalow raised up on a high foundation.
2. The subject structure is considered contributing in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
3. The subject structure is an excellent and intact example of a Craftsman Bungalow.
4. The front elevation still retains its original form.
5. Staff is unaware of any other bungalows in Mobile that have a garage on the front elevation, incorporated under the main roof and an integral part of the façade.
6. The applicants are proposing to add additional living space in the attic by adding dormers to each elevation.
7. The hipped roof is a very prominent character-defining architectural feature.
8. The dormers proposed for the north and south elevation measure approximately 14’ wide by 4’-6” tall from the point where the dormer begins to come out of the roof to the fascia.
9. The dormers are located approximately 20-6” back from the edge of the front porch.
10. The shed roof of these dormers ties into the main roof at a point 1’ below the existing ridge line.
11. Windows in these proposed dormers are triple wood casement, each with nine lites.
12. Windows of the existing house are wood nine-over-one.
13. Exterior wall material is proposed to be wood shakes.

14. The basement area of the residence has wood shakes.
15. The massing and scale of these dormers, and their proximity to the front elevation, overshadows the existing main roof and front façade.
16. The dormer proposed for the front or east elevation measures 2'-6" tall from the point where the dormer begins to come out of the roof to the fascia.
17. This dormer is 6' wide.
18. The window in the front dormer is proposed to be wood 18 lite.
19. This dormer has a hipped roof with slope matching that of the main roof.
20. This dormer is appropriate to the character and scale of the existing historic house.
21. This is a traditional way of expanding attic space.
22. The dormer proposed for the rear or west elevation measures 6'-6" tall from the point where the dormer begins to come out of the roof to the fascia.
23. This dormer is 8'-6" wide.
24. Windows for the proposed rear dormer are a pair of wood casements with six lites each.
25. This dormer has a hipped roof with slope matching that of the main roof.
26. This dormer is appropriate to the character and scale of the existing historic house.
27. This is a traditional way of expanding attic space.
28. This dormer is not visible from public view.

Staff recommends approval of the construction of the front and rear dormers. Staff recommends denial of the side dormers due to the fact that the proposed changes will materially impair the historic structure. Staff urges the applicant resubmit a more appropriate solution.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Terry and Yvonne Edeker were present to discuss the application. While a revised drawing had been submitted by their architect to staff, the applicant directed the Board to consider the original application showing shed dormers on the north and south slopes of the roof. They explained that the shed dormers would be located behind the chimneys to maintain the character of the house and would not be visible from the street. Neighbors would, however, see the dormers. The applicants noted that Fact 9 in the staff report should read: "The dormers are located approximately 28'6" back from the edge of the front porch behind the chimneys." If necessary, they would paint the dormers charcoal to make them disappear. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record but did note that painting the dormers charcoal would not be a good solution to making them disappear.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as amended by the applicant. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the dormers matching the paint colors of the rest of the house as submitted in the application. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/10/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

054-05/06-CA 908 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Dave Donnelly
Received: 3/24/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/09/06 1) 4/10/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Install 4’ high iron fence around front of property as per submitted plans. Install 6’ high capped wood privacy fence as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines For Mobile’s Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:… Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…

STAFF REPORT

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

- A. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences “...should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic Districts.”
 - 1. The subject structure is a two story frame mid nineteenth-century structure with Colonial Revival alterations.
 - 2. The subject structure is a contributing element within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 - 3. The subject lot measures approximately 70’ x 216’.
 - 4. The proposed ornamental aluminum fence is proposed to be 4’ high.
 - 5. The proposed fence is to be constructed of 5/8” square pickets with 1” square rails, spaced 3 13/16” between pickets, panel width 72 3/4”.
 - 6. The proposed fence will run across the south property line, down the west property line to a point where there is a bump-out on the main structure; also down the east property line to a point where the driveway stops.
 - 7. The proposed fence will be placed in the front of the property with matching gates at the sidewalk to the front door and the driveway.
 - 8. The proposed fence will be painted black.
 - 9. The proposed fence is identical to the fence the Board approved for 950 Palmetto Street.
 - 10. A 6’ high capped wood privacy fence identical to the fence erected across the street on the corner of Palmetto & Marine Streets.
 - 11. The fence will pick up where the ornamental aluminum fence ends and run along the perimeter of the rear property lines.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Board members questioned staff about the conflict between the submitted aluminum fence design and the iron fence represented at 950 Palmetto Street. Staff stated that while the applicant had submitted the aluminum fence application, he referenced 950 Palmetto Street. The wood fence design will match the capped fence directly across the street at 915 Marine Street.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that the fence at 950 Palmetto Street would be appropriate to the Oakleigh district, but that the aluminum fence with pinched ends would not. Changes in the facts itemized in the staff report: delete fact 9; amend fact 11 to read: “The fence will pick up where the ornamental Avalon aluminum fence ends and run along the perimeter of the rear property lines.”

FINDING OF FACT

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as amended. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald with Douglas Kearley abstaining.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application for the wood fence does not impair while the aluminum fence does impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the wood fence and the aluminum fence be denied. The motion was seconded by David Barr and approved with Harris Oswald, Cindy Klotz, and Cameron Pfeiffer voting in opposition. Tilmon Brown moved to allow staff to approve an iron fence matching 950 Palmetto Street on a mid-month basis. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.